



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/276,823 | 03/26/1999 | JOSEPH C. KAWAN | CITI0087-US | 2667 |

75127 7590 12/23/2008
KING & SPALDING LLP (CITI CUSTOMER NUMBER)
ATTN: GEORGE T. MARCOU
1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

KAZIMI, HANI M

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

3691

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

12/23/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/276,823 | Applicant(s) KAWAN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Hani Kazimi | Art Unit 3691 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on October 20, 2008. Claims 1 and 3-48 are under prosecution in this application.

Response to Applicant's Amendment

2. Applicants' amendments filed on October 20, 2008 have been fully considered, and discussed in the next section below or within the following rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 2nd, 101 and 103. Applicants' request for allowance is respectfully denied.

Response to Applicants' Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1 and 3-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In particular, claims 1 and 3-17 recite in the preamble "a system for performing a financial transaction..." the body of the claims does not contain any limitations indicating the structure of the system. A system or an apparatus claim should always claim the structure or the hardware that performs the function. Applicant's claimed limitations

Art Unit: 3691

consist of electronic applications (software according to the specification) that do not describe the structure of the system.

Claims 1 and 3-36, recite in the preamble a system, a smart card and method for performing a financial transaction. However, there is no indication anywhere in the body of the claims of a transaction being performed or taking place. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 1 and 3-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 3-17 recite in the preamble “a system for performing a financial transaction...” the body of the claims does not contain any limitations indicating the structure of the system. Therefore claims 1 and 3-17 are non-statutory because the claims are directed towards software, per se, lacking storage on a medium, which enables any underlying functionality to occur. It is not clear whether instructions are in executable form and therefore there is no practical application.

Art Unit: 3691

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent May not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 148 USPQ 459, that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or unobviousness.
5. Claims 1, 3-35, 37-42, and 44-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlisle et al in view of (Derksen and Gunzl et al) in further view of Electronic Payment Systems as discussed in the previous office action. Further:

A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See MPEP 2114 and *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1987).

Art Unit: 3691

Applicant amends the claims to add "... wherein the application-specific value is accessible for a transaction with only one type of merchant;

a second electronic application for storing general value on the transaction card, wherein the general value is accessible for use as cash; and..."

"... wherein said application-specific value and said general value are each compatible within said system for performing said financial transaction, such that general value is transferable to the application-specific value for use as application-specific value on the transaction card, and application-specific value is transferable to the general value for use as general value on the transaction card.

Examiner notes that the fact that these elements are capable of performing specific functions does not mean that they actually perform the functions as recited in the claims. The functions recited in the claim are not positive limitations but only requires the elements to be able to perform the functions.

6. Claims 36 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlisle et al in view of (Derksen and Gungl et al) in further view of Electronic Payment Systems as applied to claims above, and further in view of Taskett as discussed in the previous office action.

Response to Arguments

7. The response to Applicant's amendment with respect to the claims is mentioned above within the 35 U.S.C. 112 101 and 103 rejections of this office action.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hani Kazimi whose telephone number is (571) 272-6745. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hani M. Kazimi/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691